BF6-0113 Gopy \_2 of 3 4 June 1958

The Ramo-Wooldridge Corporation Los Angeles 45, California

## Gentlemen:

- 1. Reference is made to Proposal CMCC Doc. No. 151X5.1105 dated May 15, 1958, for customer conducted field test for the revised System 2 equipment.
- 2. Reference proposal has been reviewed by Customer No. 2 and approved.
- 3. Due to the fact that testing was originally contemplated under the System II requirements, funding for this requirement should come from the \$35,400 balance remaining for Customer No. 2 (Contract Section B.4.) at completion of R&D work on System II as set forth in CMCC Doc. No. 151X5.1082, page 3, dated New 2, 1958.

Very truly yours,

Contracting Officer

25X1

| 25X1 | Distribution: Orig - , R-W 2 - A-101, Section B.4., w/cy 1 of DPS-0736 3 - Chrono, RI |      |
|------|---|------|
| 25X1 | DPS/DCI: 1mw (4/6/58)   | 25X1 |

## SECRET

SECRET

CMCC Doc. No. 151x5. I105 Copy / of 5 Page I of 1

May 15, 1958

DPJ 0736

Dear Dan:

This is a proposal for a customer conducted field test for the revised System 2 equipment, and supersedes the proposal which was contained in our CMCC Doc. No. 1132x5.184 dated December 20, 1957. The field test program set forth in our December proposal contemplated a test of eight to nine weeks and would have called for two men in Washington and two men at Seal Beach. In response to your request for a more modest field test program, we have reduced the total time to seven weeks and plan to provide only one man in Washington. Two men will continue to be required at the Seal Beach facility, mainly for safety purposes.

As mentioned in our letter CMCC Doc. No. 151x5.1082 dated May 2, 1958, the installation of the field station and base station prototype equipment and their preliminary check-out in preparation for the field test would commence about June 30, 1958. The field tests should then commence about July 14. 1958, and continue for a period of about five weeks.

| July 14, 1958, | , and continue for a period of about five weeks.   |     |
|----------------|--|-----|
| The to         | tal estimated cost of this program would be The fee, 25X1  |     |
| at             |  | 5X1 |
| contract; ther | provisions for field testing are not contained in the present efore, it appears to us that approval of this field test program a contract amendment. |     |
|                | Sincerely,   |     |
|                | Dem  |     |
| e e            | Dean   |     |
| Enclosures:    |  |     |
| CMCC           | Doc. No. 1132x5. 209 (copies 1 - 3)  |     |

J. L. W. - AGO (copy 4 of CMCC Doc. No. 1132x5.209)

25X1

## SECRET

This document contains information affecting the nation defense of the United States within the coaling of the Espionage Lewis, Title 18 U.S.C., Siction 793 and 794, transmission or the revolution of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

25X1

cc:



Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENTOF

TO

: Special Assistant to the Director for

DATE: 10 JUN 1958

25X1

ATTN:

Planning and Development, DPS/DCI Contracting Officer

FROM : Chief, Engineering Division, OC

SUBJECT: Automatic Digital Transmission System, AS-8 (System 2)

- 1. The Ramo-Wooldridge Corporation is adapting System 2 airborne equipment to a field station communications system for the Office of Communications. Under the terms of the proposal for this work the contractor agreed to:
  - a. Design, develop, fabricate and deliver two operational prototype System 2 (AS-8) field station equipments.
  - b. Design and laboratory test one System 2 (AS-8) dual communications base station receiving equipment.
- 2. The proposal and the cost estimate (Attachment A & B, CMCC Doc. No. 151x5.1105) for field testing the AS-8 has been received from the contractor. The cover letter (Attachment A) states that provisions for field testing were not contained in the present contract, and therefore, the Ramo-Wooldridge Corporation feels that approval of the field test program would involve a contract amendment. It was the original intent of this program to employ the engineering services of the contractor in support of the field tests but this was inadvertently left out of the contract funding.

| 3∙               | Although testing is not actually funded for in   | the      |
|------------------|--|----------|
| original.        | a produce and the desire of the second secon | required |
| for this         | field testing be allotted from the balance of  | the      |
| <b>FY 1957</b> : | funding for this contract.   | <u> </u> |

25X1

Attachments:

Attachment A & B, CMCC Doc. No. 151x5.1105

25X1